

## Multi-State Review of Professional Teaching Standards

This report was developed to provide background for the first meeting of the newly formed California Standards for the Teaching Profession advisory panel, selected in September 2008 by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the California Department of Education (CDE). Panelists will play a significant role in reviewing the standards and, as needed, recommending revisions to ensure their consistency with current California education policies, current research, and effective teaching practices.<sup>1</sup> Panel members are expected to make their recommendations to the CTC and the CDE in Spring 2009.

In preparation for the panel's deliberations, CTC and CDE staffs jointly requested that the Regional Educational Laboratory West at WestEd (REL West) prepare an overview of the nature and uses of teaching standards in selected other states. They suggested four large states: Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois. Two additional states — North Carolina and Ohio — were selected because of the particular nature and content of their standards.

The body of this report provides an overview of the professional teaching standards in five of these states (New York was dropped from the review because it does not have adopted teaching standards<sup>1</sup>). We describe the review methods used; provide background demographic information about states; and summarize patterns and themes in the content, nature, and uses of professional teaching standards across the states. Appendix A comprises detailed profiles of the standards in each state, including their structure, development, and dissemination; audience and current uses; and selected content. The profiles also include Internet links to all of the professional teaching standards in these states and related documents. Appendix B includes profiles of the standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and of those developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). While not associated directly with any particular state, these last two sets of standards have guided many states in the development of their own teaching standards.

## Methods for selecting and reviewing states' teaching standards

### Selection of states

CTC and CDE staff initially requested a review of the teaching standards in large states other than California that also have relatively diverse student populations, specifically, Texas (TX), New York (NY), Florida (FL), and Illinois (IL). Subsequently, New York was removed from the list, as explained earlier, and North Carolina (NC) was added on the recommendation of a national expert on teacher induction;<sup>1</sup> this expert, well versed in many states' standards, believed the advisory committee would benefit from learning about North Carolina's standards because of what she characterizes as their high quality. Ohio (OH) was also added at the subsequent suggestion of CTC and CDE staff because Ohio's standards' structure was of interest, in that the standards are differentiated according to level of teaching performance.

---

<sup>1</sup> REL West researchers consulted with this New Teacher Center expert in preparing for the state reviews.

### Selection of topics and issues

CTC and CDE staffs requested that REL West focus the state reviews on the following topics:

- Structure of professional teaching standards;
- Development and dissemination of professional teaching standards;
- Target population covered by the standards and how the standards are used; and
- How the standards address three particular teaching-related issues:
  - Instruction of two special student populations (i.e., English learners and students qualified for special education);
  - Use of classroom technology; and
  - Instruction in the context of national and state standards and accountability policies.

### Data sources, collection, and analysis

In reviewing the standards, REL West researchers conducted document reviews and, also, interviews with representatives from each state considered to be knowledgeable about the standards. The national induction expert with whom we consulted provided us with a suggested contact at the state department of education or teacher commission in each state. In some states, we attempted to interview that recommended contact; in others, the recommended contact referred us to someone whom he or she considered more knowledgeable, and we attempted to interview that second individual.

Contacts in Florida and Ohio were unreachable during the period of this review, but REL West successfully interviewed representatives in the other four states. In each instance, researchers conducted one interview, with follow-up through emails and calls. For the interviews, researchers used a protocol developed with input from CTC and CDE, though the basic protocol was modified for each state based on a state's particular context.

After identifying the correct professional teaching standards for each state,<sup>2</sup> REL West researchers reviewed the state's standards document(s), examining the structure of the standards, the stated purposes or uses, and selected content (i.e., how the standards address the particular teaching-related issues listed above). The purpose of the interviews was to clarify issues and expand on information provided in the documents that were reviewed. In the case of Florida and Ohio, the document review served as the only source of information.

To find out how the standards address the specific teaching-related issues identified above, WestEd researchers first reviewed the standards against the criterion that a standard would be considered to be addressing one of the issues if it made "explicit reference" to certain terms related to that topic. For this review, "explicit reference" included the following words and phrases:

- *English learners*: English learners, English language learners, students whose first language is not English, students for whom English is a new language, heritage language, home language, native language, language skills, language development, language acquisition, language proficiency, linguistic background, linguistic heritage, and language.<sup>3</sup>
- *Special education*: Special education, special needs, disability(ies), and abilities.

---

<sup>2</sup> Some states have various sets of teacher-related standards. With help as available from our contacts in those states, we identified and reviewed the set of standards most analogous to California's CSTP.

<sup>3</sup> In addition, in a few cases the word "language" was viewed in the context of the sentence and deemed to meet the criterion of "explicit reference" to English learners. Those references follow: "[The competent teacher] understands how students' learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, and prior learning, as well as *language*, culture, family, and community values" (IL); "They [teachers] are perceptive listeners and are able to communicate with students in a variety of ways even when *language* is a barrier" (NC); "Teachers identify how individual experience, talents and prior learning as well as *language*, culture and family influence student learning and plan instruction accordingly" (OH).

- *Technology*: Technology(ies) and technological tools.
- *Standards and accountability*: Standards and accountability.

After interviews and document reviews were complete, we drafted a profile of each state's standards. In those states where we were able to interview a knowledgeable contact, the contact was asked to review that state's draft check for accuracy. Although we have made these efforts to ensure accuracy, readers are advised to bear in mind that much of the information provided here is based on interviews with individuals whose knowledge of the topics covered in the interviews may have certain limitations.

## Cross-State Overview

### Background information about the states reviewed

Note that in the following demographic section we have included California as a point of comparison for the other states. All of the states whose standards were reviewed for this report have large student populations relative to the rest of states. In fact, as shown in table 1, each ranks in the top 10 nationally for number of students.

**Table 1. Size of student population**

State	Student population	
	Count (in millions)	National Rank
California	6.4	1
Texas	4.5	2
Florida	2.6	4
Illinois	2.1	5
Ohio	1.8	6
North Carolina	1.4	10

*Source*: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), Local Education Agency Universe Survey, 2005–06 v.1a; State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education, 2005–06 v.1a. Data available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.

However, these states vary in the degree of diversity within their student population, as shown in table 2, which provides a demographic breakdown of the student populations in each of the five states. More than half of the students in Illinois and North Carolina are White (compared to fewer than a third in California). Texas and Florida fall between these other states, with 37 and 50 percent White students, respectively.

**Table 2. Student demographics**

State	Percentage of students who are:				
	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian or Pacific Islander	American Indian Alaskan
California	29.8	46.7	7.7	11.2	0.8
Texas	36.5	45.3	14.7	3.1	0.3
Florida	49.6	23.9	23.9	2.2	0.3
Illinois	55.4	18.6	20.3	3.8	0.2
Ohio	76.9	2.4	16.6	1.4	0.1
North Carolina	56.6	8.4	31.5	2.1	1.4

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), Local Education Agency Universe Survey, 2005–06 v.1a; State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education, 2005–06 v.1a. Data available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.

As evident in table 3, California ranks number one in the nation and, thus, tops the five states reviewed here in the proportion of its student population — 24 percent — who are English Language Learners/Limited English Proficient students (ELL/LEP). But Texas, with close to 16 percent of its students designated at ELL/LEP, is not far behind, ranking fourth nationally. In the rest of the states in this review, ELL/LEP students account for between 5 and 9 percent of the total student population.

**Table 3. English Language Learner/Limited English Proficient students**

State	Percentage of students who are English Language Learner/Limited English Proficient	
	Percent of total students	National Rank
California	24.4	1
Texas	15.7	4
Florida	8.3	12
Illinois	9.1	11
Ohio	1.6	43
North Carolina	5.2	24

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), Local Education Agency Universe Survey, 2005–06 v.1a; State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education, 2005–06 v.1a. Data available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>. Illinois' EL/LEP total and % derived from SY2004–05 data; tabulated by the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA), available at <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/faq/01leps.html>.

### Summary of five state standards review

#### *Description and structure*

All five states reviewed for this report have adopted professional teaching standards. Illinois and North Carolina each have one set of teaching standards that apply to all teachers across the career span, whereas Florida's standards are differentiated by teachers' career levels (i.e., Preprofessional, Professional, and Accomplished) and Ohio's are differentiated by performance level (i.e., Proficient, Accomplished, and Distinguished). Texas' teaching standards stand out from the rest because the state has adopted 49 different sets of standards, which are generally organized by content area and grade span. However, five of these sets of standards are called Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities standards (PPR). Four of the five sets of the PPR standards are grade-span specific, but one — PPR (EC-12) — applies to all teachers from early childhood education to 12th grade and is most akin to the CSTP in terms of content and purpose. Thus, the PPR (EC-12) document was the focus of our review of Texas standards, and any reference hereafter to Texas standards is to PPR (EC-12).<sup>4</sup>

Of the professional teaching standards documents reviewed for this report, actual page length varies between 4 (NC) and 32 pages (FL), with the number of actual standards ranging from 4 (TX) to 12 (FL). The standards documents for Illinois, North Carolina, and Ohio standards begin with introductory language; the documents for other states' standards begin immediately with the standards. Some of the documents reviewed refer to — and categorize — the state's various teaching standards by brief titles, such as "Assessment" (FL and IL), whereas others present them as statements (NC, TX, and OH); for example, in North Carolina, Standard 2 is "Teachers establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students."

No matter how it is initially introduced, a teaching standard typically is followed by statements of the various knowledge and skills teachers must have in order perform at that standard. States have different names for these statements, such as "teacher knowledge and application" (TX), "knowledge and performance indicators," (IL), and "key indicators" (FL). For discussion's sake, we refer to them simply as *indicators*.

#### *Development and dissemination*

The majority of state teaching standards reviewed here were developed after California's 1997 adoption of the CSTP. To develop their standards, most of the states relied on advisory committees comprising teachers, administrators, higher education representatives, and parents and community representatives to develop the standards. (It is not clear from review of the Florida standards and accompanying documentation how and by whom the standards were developed.)

After adoption of the standards, the states used a variety of channels for dissemination. North Carolina distributed the teaching standards to every licensed school employee at every school in the state, while Texas focused much of its dissemination efforts on teacher preparation programs. Once its standards had been adopted, Illinois, too, distributed them to preparation programs; but, while the standards were still in draft, the state used the standards review process not just to solicit feedback but also as a means to begin dissemination by getting preliminary information out to the field. (It is unclear how Florida and Ohio have disseminated teaching standards to the education field.)

#### *Standards' target populations and current uses*

With one exception, the teaching standards reviewed here apply to all teachers in their respective state, from beginning to experienced. The exception is Texas, where all 49 sets of standards are intended for

---

<sup>4</sup> Although the profile of the Texas standards focuses on PPR (EC-12), it also provides slightly more detail about the standards as a whole (i.e., all 49 sets).

beginning teachers only. But, according to the Texas state representative interviewed for this review, the influence of these educator standards has extended to pre-service and experienced teachers as well, through related preparation program requirements, certification examinations, and professional development guidelines.

Information from the other states indicates that most of them also use their teaching standards in both pre-service and in-service. In three of the five states, the teaching standards are reportedly used to guide induction (OH, IL, and TX), but North Carolina is the only one of the five currently working toward incorporating the standards into teacher evaluation.

### *Standards' approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

#### **English learners**

While all of the states in this review explicitly address English learner (EL) students in either their standards or indicators, some states have more of a focus than others on this student population. For instance, Florida addresses the EL population with indicators under all of the following standards: Diversity, Assessment, Communication, Critical Thinking, Human Development and Learning, Learning Environments, and Role of the Teacher; . These indicators cover topics including the review of assessment data to identify students' linguistic needs; collaboration with colleagues to identify and meet students' linguistic needs; ongoing development of knowledge regarding second language acquisition; communication with families from linguistically diverse backgrounds; respectful learning environments; and the right of students to use the home language. Other states (NC, TX, OH, and IL) take a less expansive approach to the needs of the EL population but, nonetheless, address several of the topics and issues outlined below.

Generally speaking, there are a few different ways in which states' standards tend to address English learners. One is to include a standard related to understanding and supporting diversity (FL, IL, OH) that references teachers' abilities to draw upon diverse backgrounds, including language. For example, Illinois' competent teacher "understands how students' learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, and prior learning, as well as language, culture, family, and community values" (p. 4).<sup>5</sup> Florida addresses this issue more extensively, stating, for example, that the *preprofessional* teacher "establishes a comfortable environment which accepts and fosters diversity. The teacher must demonstrate knowledge and awareness of varied cultures and linguistic backgrounds. The teacher creates a climate of openness, inquiry, and support by practicing strategies such as acceptance, tolerance, resolution, and mediation" (p. 4).

A second way states handle this is to emphasize the relationship between teachers' understanding of language and culture and their differentiation of instruction:

- Under North Carolina's *Standard IV* (i.e., *Teachers facilitate learning for their students*), one indicator is that "teachers understand the influences that affect individual student learning (development, culture, language proficiency, etc.) and differentiate their instruction accordingly" (p. 3).
- In Texas, the beginning teacher knows and understands "appropriate strategies for instructing English language learners" (p. 2) and is able to "adapt lessons to address students' varied backgrounds, skills, interests, and learning needs, including the needs of English language learners" (p. 2).

Ohio takes a slightly different approach, emphasizing the relationship between teachers' understanding of language and culture and the achievement of learning goals: "Teachers respect and value the native

---

<sup>5</sup> Page numbers such as this one refer to the state standards document that was reviewed for the state cited in the prior statement and that is referenced in full in the reference list on page 37.

languages and dialects of their students, and use students' current language skills to achieve content-area learning goals" (p. 10).

A third way states address EL students in their standards is to specifically highlight teachers' knowledge of learning theories, language acquisition theories, and language acquisition processes. State standards reviewed here do not reference specific theories, but several make reference to keeping abreast of new knowledge related to teaching English learners. Florida's professional teacher "is informed about developments in instructional methodology, learning theories, second language acquisition theories, psychological and sociological trends, and subject matter in order to facilitate learning" (p. 13). Illinois' competent teacher "understands the process of second language acquisition and strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English" (p. 4).

A fourth way that states seem to address EL issues in their standards is to emphasize the ability to communicate with students and their families even when language is a barrier (FL, NC). *Florida's* preprofessional teacher "identifies communication techniques for use with colleagues, school/community specialists, administrators, and families, including families whose home language is not English" (p. 2). Florida's standards even state that preprofessional teachers must respect "any student's right to use a home language other than English for academic and social purposes" (p. 7). In North Carolina's standards, teachers are "perceptive listeners and are able to communicate with students in a variety of ways even when language is a barrier" (p. 4).

Assessment is a final aspect of how the needs of EL students might be addressed in a state's professional teaching standards. Two states, Florida and Illinois, explicitly address assessment. Florida simply refers to using assessment data to determine, among other things, the "language development progress" of incoming students. Illinois is more activist in its approach to this particular issue: "The competent teacher uses assessment strategies and devices which are nondiscriminatory and take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language on measuring knowledge and performance of students" (p. 8).

### Special education

All of the state teaching standards reviewed by REL West in some way address the instruction of students with disabilities and other special needs. But, as was the case with addressing the needs of the EL population, some states (in this case, Illinois and Ohio) offer more extensive and specific guidance than others. In fact, each of the 11 Illinois Professional Teaching Standards includes knowledge and performance indicators focused on the teaching of students with disabilities. Similarly, Ohio embeds several special-education-related teaching indicators in other standards. These embedded indicators tend to involve, among other things, understanding how a student's disability affects his or her patterns of learning; knowing how to differentiate instruction and provide students with access to general curricular content; collaborating with IEP teams; and understanding students' rights and regulations associated with screening/monitoring, assessment, and referrals.

Of the states reviewed, Texas, Florida, and North Carolina tended to address special education students more narrowly, articulating expectations for flexible pedagogy, collaboration with specialists, and knowledge of related legal issues. For example:

- Texas' PPR (EC-12) standards focus primarily on teachers' knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and the legal requirements related to special education.
- Florida mentions the use of learning strategies that, among other issues, reflect students' special needs.
- North Carolina, on the other hand, has just one element related to special education, but it covers more issues than either Texas or Florida: "Teachers adapt their teaching for the benefit of students with special needs. Teachers collaborate with the range of support specialists to help

meet the special needs of all students. Through inclusion and other models of effective practice, teachers engage students to ensure that their needs are met” (p. 2).

### *Standards’ approach to teacher’s use of technology*

Teachers’ use of technology is explicitly addressed in the teaching standards of each state reviewed for this report. The standards of Illinois and Texas include a large number of specific references to the use of technology, but, in addition, both states have produced a separate set of standards exclusively addressing classroom technology (i.e., *Technology Standards for All Illinois Teachers* and *Texas Approved New Educator Standards: Technology Applications*). A review of the primary teaching standards documents in these two states showed that Illinois has 14 references to educational technology under 6 of its 11 standards and that Texas addresses technology under 3 of its 4 PPR (EC-12) standards. Teachers’ knowledge of the effective use of technology is emphasized in each state’s set of professional teaching standards. For example, in Texas, the “beginning teacher is able to select and use instructional materials, resources, and technologies that are suitable for instructional goals and that engage students cognitively” (p. 11). In Illinois, the “competent teacher understands how to integrate technology into classroom instruction” (p. 5). Both states’ standards also address the need to use appropriate technology in assessing students. Illinois’ standards cover more technology-related topics than Texas’s, including the importance of using a “wide range of instructional strategies and technologies to meet and enhance diverse student needs” (p. 4); reviewing and evaluating “educational technologies to determine instructional value” (p. 5); and using “various technological tools to access and manage information” (p. 5).

Standards in North Carolina, Ohio, and Florida include fewer references to technology than those in Illinois and Texas but, in some cases, cover several topics in a given indicator:

- North Carolina’s *Standard IV* states that teachers “integrate and utilize technology in their instruction. Teachers know when and how to use technology to maximize student learning. Teachers help students use technology to learn content, think critically, solve problems, discern reliability, use information, communicate, innovate, and collaborate” (p. 4).
- Ohio’s *Standard 4* expects the state’s *Proficient* teachers to “effectively use technology that is appropriate to their disciplines” (p. 21) and “effectively support students in their use of technology” (p. 21), while it expects *Accomplished* teachers to “develop students’ abilities to access, evaluate and use technology” (p. 21) and “help their colleagues understand and integrate technology into instruction” (p. 21).
- Florida’s *Professional* teacher “uses technology (as appropriate) to establish an atmosphere of active learning with existing and emerging technologies available at the school site. She/he provides students with opportunities to use technology to gather and share information with others, and facilitates access to the use of electronic resources” (p. 20).

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

Several of the sets of state teaching standards reviewed here (FL, IL, and TX) were initially conceptualized in the late 1990s as part of a statewide shift toward standards-based education that also involved the parallel development and implementation of a statewide system of content standards and assessments for students. Because of this development trajectory, in these states the teaching standards tend to serve as a counterpart to the student standards within the state accountability system. Indeed, as several interviewees suggested, it may, in fact, be difficult to consider one set of standards without talking about the other. (In Texas, where most of the teaching standards are content-area specific and are aligned to student standards, the two sets of standards have been consistently revised alongside one another to ensure that alignment.)



Nonetheless, some states have included in their teaching standards specific references to their academic content standards for students; these references generally emphasize teacher knowledge of and ability to design instruction around student the content standards.

- Florida's *Preprofessional* and *Professional* teachers are expected to provide "comprehensible instruction based on performance standards required of students in Florida public schools" (pp. 8, 18), while the state's *Professional* and *Accomplished* teachers take advantage of "technology tools that enhance learning opportunities that are aligned with the Sunshine State Standards" (pp. 20, 29). *Accomplished* teachers are expected, additionally, to communicate "with students, families, and the community to assess the relevance of the curriculum and adequacy of student progress toward standards" (p. 22).
- In Illinois, the *Competent* teacher knows how to use the Illinois Academic Standards to plan instruction (p. 5) and also evaluate what students "know and are able to do in meeting the Illinois Academic Standards" (p. 8).
- North Carolina's student content standards, "Standard Course of Study," are primarily expressed in teaching *Standard III: Teachers know the content they teach*. Elements of this standard reveal that teachers are expected to align instruction with the student standards, and help students make connections between the student standards and "21st Century content, which includes global awareness; financial, economic, business, and entrepreneurial literacy; civic literacy; and health awareness" (p. 3).
- Ohio expects its teachers to "understand" and "articulate the important content, concepts and processes in school and district curriculum priorities and in the Ohio academic content standards" (p. 13). The standards also state that teachers should "extend and enrich curriculum by integrating school and district curriculum priorities with Ohio's academic content standards and national content standards" (p. 13).
- Texas' PPR (EC-12) standards lay out a sequential list of knowledge and skills that articulate what beginning teachers should know and be able to do related to student content standards, stating that the beginning teacher should
  - Know and understand the "importance of the state content and performance standards" (p. 3);
  - "Use the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) to plan instruction" (p. 3);
  - Know and understand "the importance of designing instruction that reflects the TEKS" (p. 4);
  - "Plan instructional activities that progress sequentially and support stated instructional goals based on the TEKS" (p. 4); and
  - Know and understand "the connection between the Texas statewide assessment program, the TEKS, and instruction" (p. 5).

### Profiles of teaching standards

The following section in this report, appendix A, provides state-by-state profiles of the state teaching standards that have been introduced as part of the above cross-site analysis. Appendix B then provides a profile of each of the sets of national standards that have been influential in the development of teaching standards at the state level: the *National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Propositions*, and the *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue*, developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

A note about terminology and citation of the standards in these profiles:

*Terminology.* We found that some states delineate a clear set of terms to refer to all the various aspects of their teaching standards, while other states have no specific nomenclature for the various sub-elements of a standard. In each of the following state profiles, we describe the structure of the set of standards

reviewed and, to the extent possible, use the state's own terminology, as found in the document(s) reviewed. When using descriptive terms specific to a state's document(s), we capitalize and italicize each term (e.g., *Propositions*). When a state has not used specific terminology to name some or all of the sub-elements of a standard, we apply our own terminology, as follows: standard (for a category, such as "assessment" or "knowledge of subject matter"), element (for a description), and indicator (for a behavior or performance).

*Citation.* When a standard or any of its sub-elements is presented, its citation includes the number of the standard and, if relevant, of the related sub-element, as well as the page number for where the standard can be found in the state's standards document. In the Florida and Ohio profiles, we have also cited supporting documents, using the APA style for text references, with the reference document fully identified at the end of the profile.

## Appendix A

### State-by-State Profiles

#### FLORIDA

Title of standards: *Accomplished, Professional and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21st Century*, also called *Educator Accomplished Practices*

Page length: 32

Available at [http://www.fldoe.org/dpe/pdf/AccomPractices\\_11-09-07.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/dpe/pdf/AccomPractices_11-09-07.pdf)

#### *Standards*

- |                             |                                 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Assessment               | 7. Human Development & Learning |
| 2. Communication            | 8. Knowledge of Subject Matter  |
| 3. Continuous Improvement   | 9. Learning Environments        |
| 4. <i>Critical Thinking</i> | 10. Planning                    |
| 5. Diversity                | 11. Role of the Teacher         |
| 6. Ethics                   | 12. Technology                  |

#### *Description and structure*

The document that articulates Florida's *Educator Accomplished Practices* (EAPs) contains no preamble or explanatory introduction; however, in 2002, the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) produced a separate [introductory overview](http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf) ([http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student\\_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf](http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf)) for the EAPs. The EAPs themselves essentially serve as three separate sets of competencies, each targeting a different teacher-experience level defined by the state (FLDOE, 2002):

- *Preprofessional*: teachers who have just received their teaching degree
- *Professional*: teachers who have received their first five-year permanent certificate
- *Accomplished*: outstanding teachers

Each section consists of 12 *Competencies*, each one followed by a series of *Sample Key Indicators*.

#### *Development and dissemination*

According to the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE), the development and adoption of the EAPs in the late 1990s (via [F.A.C. 6A-5.065](#)) was “part of a national transition to standards-based education” (FLDOE, 2002, p. 1). As with other state standards, the EAPs were drawn from the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) teaching standards. The EAPs and the state's student content standards, called the “K-12 Sunshine State Standards,” serve as central parts of Florida's system for school improvement and accountability, known as the “A+ Plan” (FLDOE, 2002).

#### *Standards' target populations and current uses*

The EAPs apply to all teachers in Florida, from *Preprofessional* to *Accomplished*. Florida's “entire certification and in-service training structure” is based on candidates' demonstration of the EAPs (FLDOE, 2002, p. 1). Colleges of education and school districts must ensure that teachers seeking

professional certification have “demonstrated the Educator Accomplished Practices, have the basic skills and general knowledge needed to teach and the content knowledge to teach the Sunshine State Standards” (Ibid., p. 1). Florida’s teachers are assessed through the Florida Teacher Certification Examination and college- or district-administered assessments of the EAPs.

### *Standards’ approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

**English learners.** Florida’s EAPs address English learner students and second language acquisition extensively. To begin with, EAP 5 is entirely focused on Diversity:

*Preprofessional teacher:*<sup>6</sup> establishes a comfortable environment [that] accepts and fosters diversity. The teacher must demonstrate knowledge and awareness of varied cultures and linguistic backgrounds. The teacher creates a climate of openness, inquiry, and support by practicing strategies such as acceptance, tolerance, resolution, and mediation (*EAP 5 Diversity*, p. 4).

For each of the three teaching levels, 13 *Sample Key Indicators* are provided under EAP 5 Diversity.

English learners and second language development and acquisition also are explicitly addressed in *Sample Key Indicators* under several other EAPs:

*Preprofessional teacher:* identifies communication techniques for use with colleagues, school/community specialists, administrators, and families, including families whose home language is not English (*EAP 2 Communication, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 2).

*Preprofessional teacher:* works to continue the development of her/his own background in instructional methodology, learning theories, second language acquisition theories, trends, and subject matter (*EAP 3 Continuous Improvement, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 3).

*Preprofessional teacher:* recognizes learning theories, subject matter structure, curriculum development, student development, and first and second language acquisition processes (*EAP 7 Human Development and Learning, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 6).

*Preprofessional teacher:* respects any student’s right to use a home language other than English for academic and social purposes (*EAP 9 Learning Environments, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 7).

*Professional teacher:* reviews assessment data concerning the students so as to determine their entry-level skills, deficiencies, academic and language development progress, and personal strengths (*EAP 1 Assessment, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 11).

*Professional teacher:* is informed about developments in instructional methodology, learning theories, second language acquisition theories, psychological and sociological trends, and subject matter in order to facilitate learning (*EAP 3 Continuous Improvement, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 13).

*Accomplished teacher:* reviews assessment data about individual students to determine their entry-level skills, deficiencies, academic and language development progress, and personal strengths to modify instruction-based assessment (*EAP 1 Assessment, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 21).

*Accomplished teacher:* demonstrates respect for diverse perspectives, ideas, and options and encourages contributions from any array of school and community sources, including communities whose heritage language is not English (*EAP 3 Continuous Improvement, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 23).

*Accomplished teacher:* keeps abreast of developments in instructional methodology, learning theories, second language acquisition theories, psychological and sociological trends, and subject matter in order to facilitate learning (*EAP 3 Continuous Improvement, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 23).

---

<sup>6</sup> In the standards document itself, the experience level of the teachers is not repeated with each *Sample Key Indicator* as shown here.

*Professional teacher*: drawing upon well-established human development/learning theories and concepts and a variety of information about students, provides learning opportunities appropriate to student learning style, linguistic and cultural heritage, experiential background and developmental level (*EAP 7 Human Development and Learning*, p. 16).

*Accomplished teacher*: develops instructional curriculum with attention to learning theory, subject matter structure, curriculum development, student development, and first and second language acquisition processes (*EAP 7 Human Development and Learning, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 26).

**Special education.** Students with special needs are addressed under Florida's *EAP 5 Diversity for Accomplished teachers*.<sup>7</sup>

*Accomplished teacher*: uses learning strategies that reflect each student's culture, learning styles, special needs, and socioeconomic background (*EAP 5 Diversity*, p. 24).

### *Standards' approach to teacher's use of technology*

Florida's EAP 12 focuses on Technology:

*Preprofessional teacher*: uses technology as available at the school site and as appropriate to the learner. She/he provides students with opportunities to actively use technology and facilitates access to the use of electronic resources. The teacher also uses technology to manage, evaluate, and improve instruction (*EAP 12 Technology*, p. 9).

*Professional teacher*: uses technology (as appropriate) to establish an atmosphere of active learning with existing and emerging technologies available at the school site. She/he provides students with opportunities to use technology to gather and share information with others, and facilitates access to the use of electronic resources (*EAP 12 Technology*, p. 20).

*Accomplished teacher*: uses appropriate technology in teaching and learning processes (*EAP 12 Technology*, p. 29).

For each of the three teaching levels, 13 *Key Sample Indicators* are provided for *EAP 12 Technology*.

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

As previously noted, Florida's EAPs were adopted in the late 1990s as part of a statewide shift toward standards-based education — a trend that also led to the development and implementation of the K–12 Sunshine State Standards and the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). According to FLDOE (2002), “The Educator Accomplished Practices are for teachers what the Sunshine State Standards are for K–12 students” (p. 1). Both are key components of the state's school improvement and accountability system. “Just as K–12 schools have to ensure that students have learned the Sunshine State Standards through a testing program (FCAT and Florida Writes), colleges of education and school districts must ensure that teachers seeking a Professional Certificate have demonstrated the Educator Accomplished Practices, have the basic skills and general knowledge needed to teach, and the content knowledge to teach the Sunshine State Standards” (Ibid., p. 1).

---

<sup>7</sup> There are two other references that also appear to be related to students with disabilities. We did not include them in our review because they did not meet our search criterion. They are:

1) *Accomplished teacher* communicates procedures/behaviors effectively, in both verbal and nonverbal styles, with all students, including those with handicapping conditions and those of varying cultural and linguistic backgrounds (*EAP 3 Communication*, p. 22). 2) *Professional teacher* and *Accomplished teacher* uses accessible and assistive technology to provide curriculum access to those students who need additional support to access the information provided in the general education curriculum as available at each school site (*EAP 12 Technology*, pp. 20, 29).

There are also specific references in the EAPs to the state's academic standards for students:

*Preprofessional* teacher: provides comprehensible instruction based on performance standards required of students in Florida public schools (*EAP 10 Planning, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 8).

*Professional* teacher: provides comprehensible instruction based on performance standards required of students in Florida public schools (*EAP 10 Planning, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 18).

*Professional* teacher: uses technology tools that enhance learning opportunities that are aligned with the Sunshine State Standards (*EAP 12 Technology, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 20).

*Accomplished* teacher: communicates with students, families, and the community to assess the relevance of the curriculum and adequacy of student progress toward standards (*EAP 3 Continuous Improvement, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 22).

*Accomplished* teacher: evaluates and implements technology tools that enhance learning opportunities that are aligned with Sunshine State Standards and meet the needs of all learners (*EAP 12 Technology, Sample Key Indicator*, p. 29).

### *Additional reference*

Florida Department of Education. (2002). *Introduction to the Educator Accomplished Practices*.

Retrieved September 2008, from [http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student\\_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf](http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf).

## ILLINOIS

Title of standards: *Illinois Professional Teaching Standards*

Page length: 10

Available at [www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/pdfs/ipts.pdf](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/pdfs/ipts.pdf)

### *Standards*

- |                                 |                                      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Content Knowledge            | 7. Communication                     |
| 2. Human Development & Learning | 8. Assessment                        |
| 3. Diversity                    | 9. Collaborative Relationships       |
| 4. Planning for Instruction     | 10. Reflection & Professional Growth |
| 5. Learning Environment         | 11. Professional Conduct             |
| 6. Instructional Delivery       |                                      |
- 

### *Description and structure*

The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTs) are contained in a stand-alone document of the same name that generally parallels the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) core standards (<http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>).

Like the INTASC core standards, the IPTs are introduced with a several-paragraph preamble that starts, “We believe...” Eleven *Standards* follow (INTASC calls them “Principles”), each with a list of *Knowledge Indicators* and *Performance Indicators* that define “the competent teacher.”

The IPTs differ from the INTASC core standards in that:

- The IPTs are slightly different in wording and sequence, though the content of the two sets of standards is similar,
- Illinois added an 11th standard addressing professional conduct, and
- The INTASC standards include “dispositions” under each principle that describe desired teacher attitudes.

### *Development and dissemination*

The IPTs were developed by an advisory committee comprising content specialists, teachers, administrators, parent groups, the Business Roundtable, and higher education faculty and administrators. The advisory committee closely modeled the IPTs after the INTASC core standards.

After the IPTs were developed, the committee crafted separate, complementary teacher standards entitled *Language Arts Standards for All Teachers* ([http://www.isbe.net/profprep/CASCDvr/pdfs/24110\\_corelangarts\\_std.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/profprep/CASCDvr/pdfs/24110_corelangarts_std.pdf)), and *Technology Standards for All Teachers* ([http://www.isbe.net/profprep/CASCDvr/pdfs/24120\\_coretechnology.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/profprep/CASCDvr/pdfs/24120_coretechnology.pdf)).

The Illinois State Board of Education and State Teacher Certification Board adopted the IPTs and the companion language arts and technology standards in 2004; the sets of standards have not been revised

since. Hereafter, the IPTS and the companion language arts and technology standards are referred to as “IPTS.”

The state department of education engaged state teacher unions to spread the word about the IPTS among Illinois educators. The field also became acquainted with the IPTS indirectly as teacher education program review processes and certification requirements were revised to reflect the new standards.

### *Standards’ target populations and current uses*

The IPTS are intended to represent what a “competent teacher” should know and be able to do. As listed below, initiatives related to all stages of the teacher development continuum stem from the IPTS.

- Preparation: Criteria for teacher education program approval include a requirement that the programs align their curricula with the IPTS.
- Certification: The Assessment of Professional Teaching exams ([http://www.icts.nesinc.com/PDFs/IL\\_OBJ101\\_104.pdf](http://www.icts.nesinc.com/PDFs/IL_OBJ101_104.pdf)), required for teacher certification, are aligned with the IPTS.
- Induction: The Illinois State Board of Education is piloting induction and mentoring programs for new teachers that reflect the IPTS. The programs are based on the IPTS and best practices related to induction and mentoring.
- Professional Development: State approval of professional development plans and programs depends, in part, on their alignment with the IPTS.

### *Standards’ approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

**English learners.** English learners are explicitly addressed under *Standard 3: Diversity* (p. 4), *Standard 7: Communication*, and *Standard 8: Assessment* (p. 7).

The *Competent* teacher<sup>8</sup>: understands the process of second language acquisition and strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English (*Standard 3, Knowledge Indicator 3B*, p. 4).

The *Competent* teacher: understands how students’ learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, and prior learning, as well as language, culture, family, and community values (*Standard 3, Knowledge Indicator 3C*, p. 4).

The *Competent* teacher: understands communication theory, language development, and the role of language in learning (*Standard 7, Knowledge Indicator 7A*, p. 7).

The *Competent* teacher: uses assessment strategies and devices [that] are nondiscriminatory and take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language on measuring knowledge and performance of students (*Standard 8, Performance Indicator 8Q*, p. 8).

The interviewee in Illinois acknowledged that, given increasing diversity in the state’s schools, the IPTS need to address the EL population to a greater degree.

**Special education.** The IPTS document includes a note prior to the standards themselves that reads, “Bold sections indicate the addition of special education professional knowledge and performance indicators.” While several of the bolded items did not meet our criterion for inclusion in this review, 27 *Knowledge and Performance Indicators* under 10 of the 11 *Standards* include references to special education that did meet our criterion:

---

<sup>8</sup> In the standards document itself, *Competent* teacher is not repeated with each *Knowledge/Performance Indicator* as shown here.



The *Competent* teacher: understands how a student's disability affects processes of inquiry and influences patterns of learning (*Standard 1: Content Knowledge, Knowledge Indicator 1E*, p. 3).

The *Competent* teacher: designs learning experiences and utilizes adaptive devices/technology to provide access to the general curricular content to individuals with disabilities (*Standard 1: Content Knowledge, Performance Indicator 1M*, p. 3).

The *Competent* teacher: knows the impact of cognitive, emotional, physical, and sensory disabilities on learning and communication processes (*Standard 2: Human Development and Learning, Knowledge Indicator 2F*, p. 4).

The *Competent* teacher: demonstrates positive regard for the culture, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and varying abilities of individual students and their families (*Standard 3: Diversity, Performance Indicator 3N*, p. 4).

The *Competent* teacher: uses IEP goals and objectives to plan instruction for students with disabilities (*Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, Performance Indicator 4S*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: knows applicable laws, rules and regulations, procedural safeguards, and ethical considerations regarding planning and implementing behavioral change programs for individuals with disabilities (*Standard 5: Learning Environment, Knowledge Indicator 5F*, p. 6).

The *Competent* teacher: knows techniques for modifying instructional methods, materials, and the environment to facilitate learning for students with disabilities and/or diverse learning characteristics (*Standard 6: Instructional Delivery, Knowledge Indicator 6E*, p. 6).

The *Competent* teacher: uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with disabilities (*Standard 6: Instructional Delivery, Performance Indicator 6M*, p. 7).

The *Competent* teacher: knows legal provisions, regulations, and guidelines regarding assessment (and inclusion in statewide assessments) of individuals with disabilities (*Standard 8: Assessment, Knowledge Indicator 8F*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: knows methods for monitoring progress of individuals with disabilities (*Standard 8: Assessment, Knowledge Indicator 8G*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: knows strategies that consider the influence of diversity and disability on assessment, eligibility, programming, and placement of students with disabilities (*Standard 8: Assessment, Knowledge Indicator 8H*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: collaborates with families and other professionals involved in the assessment of individuals with disabilities (*Standard 8: Assessment, Performance Indicator 8N*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: uses assessment strategies and devices [that] are nondiscriminatory and take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language on measuring knowledge and performance of students (*Standard 8: Assessment, Performance Indicator 8Q*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: understands the concerns of parents of individuals with disabilities and knows appropriate strategies to collaborate with parents in addressing these concerns (*Standard 9: Collaborative Relationships, Knowledge Indicator 9F*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: understands roles of individuals with disabilities, parents, teachers, and other school and community personnel in planning individualized education programs for students with disabilities (*Standard 9: Collaborative Relationships, Knowledge Indicator 9G*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: collaborates in the development of comprehensive individualized education programs for students with disabilities (*Standard 9: Collaborative Relationships, Performance Indicator 9O*, p. 9).

The *Competent* teacher: collaborates with the student and family in setting instructional goals and charting progress of students with disabilities (*Standard 9: Collaborative Relationships, Performance Indicator 9Q*, p. 9).

The *Competent* teacher: communicates with team members about characteristics and needs of individuals with specific disabilities (*Standard 9: Collaborative Relationships, Performance Indicator 9R*, p. 9).

The *Competent* teacher: understands teachers' attitudes and behaviors that positively or negatively influence behavior of individuals with disabilities (*Standard 10: Reflection and Professional Growth, Knowledge Indicator 10D*, p. 9).

The *Competent* teacher: assesses his or her own needs for knowledge and skills related to teaching students with disabilities and seeks assistance and resources (*Standard 10: Reflection and Professional Growth, Performance Indicator 10I*, p. 9).

The *Competent* teacher: is familiar with the rights of students with disabilities (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Knowledge Indicator 11F*, p. 10).

The *Competent* teacher: knows the roles and responsibilities of teachers, parents, students and other professionals related to special education (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Knowledge Indicator 11G*, p. 10).

The *Competent* teacher: knows identification and referral procedures for students with disabilities (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Knowledge Indicator 11H*, p. 10).

The *Competent* teacher: demonstrates commitment to developing the highest educational and quality-of-life potential of students with disabilities (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Performance Indicator 11O*, p. 10).

The *Competent* teacher: complies with local, state, and federal monitoring and evaluation requirements related to students with disabilities (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Performance Indicator 11R*, p. 10).

The *Competent* teacher: complies with local, state, and federal regulations and policies related to students with disabilities (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Performance Indicator 11S*, p. 10).

The *Competent* teacher: uses a variety of instructional and intervention strategies prior to initiating a referral of a student for special education (*Standard 11: Professional Conduct and Leadership, Performance Indicator 11T*, p. 10).

### *Standards' approach to teacher's use of technology*

Education technology is addressed early in the IPTS. The preamble to the IPTS states: The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards should reflect the changing resources available for teaching, such as technology and community options and the new expectations for accountability and the accompanying need for an understanding of assessment strategies (p. 1).

Following the preamble are 14 references to education technology under 6 of the 11 standards.

The *Competent* teacher: designs learning experiences to promote student skills in the use of technologies appropriate to the discipline (*Standard 1: Content Knowledge, Performance Indicator 1I*, p. 3).

The *Competent* teacher: designs learning experiences and utilizes adaptive devices/technology to provide access to general curricular content to individuals with disabilities (*Standard 1: Content Knowledge, Performance Indicator 1M*, p. 3).

The *Competent* teacher: uses a wide range of instructional strategies and technologies to meet and enhance diverse student needs (*Standard 3: Diversity, Performance Indicator 3K*, p. 4).

The *Competent* teacher: understands how to integrate technology into classroom instruction (*Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, Knowledge Indicators 4E*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: understands how to review and evaluate educational technologies to determine instructional value (*Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, Knowledge Indicator 4F*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: understands how to use various technological tools to access and manage information (*Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, Knowledge Indicator 4G*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: understands the uses of technology to address student needs (*Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, Knowledge Indicator 4H*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: accesses and uses a wide range of information and instructional technologies to enhance student learning (*Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, Performance Indicator 4R*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: uses strategies to create a smoothly functioning learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, participate in decision making, work collaboratively and independently, use appropriate technology, and engage in purposeful learning activities (*Standard 5: Learning Environment, Performance Indicator 5K*, p. 6).

The *Competent* teacher: knows how to enhance learning through the use of a wide variety of materials as well as human and technological resources (*Standard 6: Instructional Delivery, Knowledge Indicator 6C*, p. 6).

The *Competent* teacher: uses a wide range of technologies to enhance student learning (*Standard 6: Instructional Delivery, Performance Indicator 6K*, p. 7).

The *Competent* teacher: uses technology appropriately to accomplish instructional objectives (*Standard 6: Instructional Delivery, Performance Indicator 6N*, p. 7).

The *Competent* teacher: uses appropriate technologies to monitor and assess student progress (*Standard 8: Assessment, Performance Indicator 8M*, p. 8).

The *Competent* teacher: uses technology appropriately in conducting assessments and interpreting results (*Standard 8: Assessment, Performance Indicator 8P*, p. 8).

In addition, the IPTS companion document, *Technology Standards for All Illinois Teachers* (which follows the same format as the IPTS) has eight *Standards*, each followed by *Knowledge Indicators* and *Performance Indicators*. These standards are

1. Basic Computer/Technology Operations and Concepts,
2. Personal and Professional Use of Technology,
3. Application of Technology in Instruction,
4. Social, Ethical, and Human Issues,
5. Productivity Tools,
6. Telecommunications and Information Access,
7. Research, Problem Solving, and Product Development, and
8. Information Literacy Skills.

*Connections to standards and accountability*

As is true for the other states in this review, student academic standards served as the catalyst for Illinois' teaching standards. The first paragraph of the preamble in the IPTS document states, "The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards should reflect the learning goals and academic standards [that] are established for Illinois students" (p. 1). The preamble further states that the teaching standards "should reflect the changing resources available for teaching, such as technology and community options and the new expectations for accountability and the accompanying need for an understanding of assessment strategies (p. 1). According to the IPTS, competent teachers are expected to understand the student standards, relate those standards to the instructional plan, and use assessment to gauge students' mastery of the standards. Specifically, one *Knowledge Indicator* under each of two standards — Standard 4: Planning for Instruction, and Standard 8: Assessment — addresses the relationship between teaching and student achievement of academic standards:

The *Competent* teacher: understands the Illinois Academic Standards, curriculum development, content, learning theory, and student development and knows how to incorporate this knowledge in planning instruction (*Standard 4, Knowledge Indicator 4A*, p. 5).

The *Competent* teacher: understands assessment as a means of evaluating how students learn, what they know and are able to do in meeting the Illinois Academic Standards, and what kinds of experiences will support their further growth and development (*Standard 8, Knowledge Indicator 8A*, p. 8).

## NORTH CAROLINA

Title of standards: *North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards*

Page length: 4

Available at [www.ncptsc.org/Final%20Document.pdf](http://www.ncptsc.org/Final%20Document.pdf)

### *Standards*

1. Teachers demonstrate leadership
  2. Teachers establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students
  3. Teachers know the content they teach
  4. Teachers facilitate learning for their students
  5. Teachers reflect on their practice
- 

### *Description and structure*

The North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (NCPTS) are contained in a four-page booklet. The intent is that this booklet be placed in teachers' lesson plan books to guide instruction.

The NCPTS booklet begins with an introduction laying out the teaching standards development process and "a new vision of teaching" (p. 1). There are five *Standards*, each subsequently broken into elements and bulleted indicators. The North Carolina interviewee stated that the document's brevity and repetition were purposeful, in that the North Carolina Teaching Standards Commission wanted to make it user-friendly for busy teachers. Equally important, Commission members reportedly wanted the booklet to contribute to the development of future assessment by using concise, measurable language.

### *Development and dissemination*

In August 2006, the North Carolina State Board of Education adopted a new mission: "Every public school student will graduate from high school, globally competitive for work and postsecondary education and prepared for life in the 21st Century" (p. 1). Subsequently, the State Board asked the North Carolina Teaching Standards Commission to align previous teaching standards (1998) with this new mission and related goals. The 16-member Commission, comprising teachers, administrators, and higher education representatives, began by reviewing state professional teaching standards from California, West Virginia, Ohio, and Alabama. However, the Commission felt those standards did not adequately address the State Board's mission as it related to 21st century skills.

The Commission then reviewed the work of the Center for International Understanding (<http://ciu.northcarolina.edu/content.php/system/index.htm>) and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (<http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/>) to better understand the meaning of the term "21st Century skills." The interviewee said that the information gathered from those organizations was critical to the development of the NCPTS. A review of the work of NBPTS ([http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what\\_teachers.pdf](http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what_teachers.pdf)), and data from the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey and related research ([www.ncteachingconditions.org](http://www.ncteachingconditions.org)), informed the development of the teacher standards.

The Commission cultivated the support of key stakeholders during the development process. For example, the North Carolina Association of Educators helped vet the draft standards with its members.

Based on such input, the Commission reprioritized and rewrote parts of the draft standards. The Commission also conducted focus groups with broad participation throughout the state.

The State Board adopted the NCPTS in June 2007. In disseminating the standards, the Commission focused on teachers and school-level leadership. Copies of the newly adopted NCPTS were mailed to every licensed employee in all North Carolina schools. The mailing included a letter asking principals to present the standards at a faculty meeting and directing them to think about the degree to which their current activities reflected the newly adopted teacher standards.

### *Standards' target populations and current uses*

The NCPTS apply to all teachers and are used for a variety of purposes.

- **Preparation:** The state is in the process of linking teacher preparation program approval to a teacher candidate rubric that is based on the NCPTS and the Rubric for Evaluating North Carolina Teachers.
- **Evaluation:** In the past, North Carolina districts could choose from several teacher evaluation instruments. But based on the adoption of the NCPTS, the state has developed an evaluation instrument called the Rubric for Evaluating North Carolina Teachers. Over the next three years, all school districts will move to this teacher evaluation instrument (<http://www.ncptsc.org/Teacher-enabled.pdf>).
- **Professional development:** Professional Growth Plans for teachers will be linked to the results of the Summary Rating Form at the conclusion of the NC Teacher Evaluation Process (<http://www.ncptsc.org/Teacher-enabled.pdf>).

### *Standards' approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

**English learners.** The EL population is explicitly addressed under *Standard IV* of the NCPTS: Teachers facilitate learning for their students (p. 3).

Teachers understand the influences that affect individual student learning (development, culture, language proficiency, etc.) and differentiate their instruction accordingly (*Standard IV*, [element 1], p. 3).

They [teachers] are perceptive listeners and are able to communicate with students in a variety of ways even when language is a barrier (*Standard IV*, [element 7], p. 4).

**Special education.** NCPTS *Standard II* lays out expectations for teaching students with disabilities.

Teachers adapt their teaching for the benefit of students with special needs. Teachers collaborate with the range of support specialists to help meet the special needs of all students. Through inclusion and other models of effective practice, teachers engage students to ensure that their needs are met (*Standard II*, [element 4], p. 2).

### *Standards' approach to teacher's use of technology*

Education technology is first addressed in the introduction to the NCPTS, under the heading "A New Vision for Teaching," which describes revising core content "to include skills like critical thinking, problem solving, and information and communications technology (ICT) literacy" (p. 1). The use of education technology is also addressed under NCPTS *Standard IV*.

Teachers employ a wide range of techniques using information and communication technology, learning styles, and differentiated instruction (*Standard IV*, [element 3], p. 3).

Teachers integrate and utilize technology in their instruction. Teachers know when and how to use technology to maximize student learning. Teachers help students use technology to learn content, think critically, solve problems, discern reliability, use information, communicate, innovate, and collaborate (*Standard IV*, [element 4], p. 4).

[Teachers] help students use technology to learn content, think critically, solve problems, discern reliability, use information, communicate, innovate, and collaborate (*Standard IV*, [element 4, indicator 2], p. 4).

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

The link between the NCPTS and the student content standards, the North Carolina Standard Course of Study, is clearly expressed in *Standard III*: Teachers know the content they teach (p. 3). Elements of this standard reveal that teachers are expected to align instruction with the student standards and to help students make connections between the student standards and “21st Century content, which includes global awareness; financial, economic, business, and entrepreneurial literacy; civic literacy; and health awareness” (p. 3).

Student standards are also addressed in an element under *Standard IV*, “Teachers plan instruction appropriate for their students” (*Standard IV*, [element 2], p. 3). The narrative that follows goes on to say, “Teachers collaborate with their colleagues and use a variety of data sources for short and long range planning based on the North Carolina Standard Course of Study” (Ibid.).

The North Carolina interviewee indicated that the environment of increased accountability that teachers must navigate is also reflected in *Standard I*: Teachers demonstrate leadership (p. 1). She highlighted the following element of teacher leadership regarding the use of data as a driver of student progress and school improvement:

Teachers lead in their classrooms. Teachers use various types of assessment data during the school year to evaluate student progress and to make adjustments to the teaching and learning process (*Standard I*, [element 1], p. 2).

## OHIO

Title of standards: *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession*

Page length: 31

Available at [http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/Word/Oh\\_Standards\\_For\\_TchingProf\\_8\\_30\\_06.doc](http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/Word/Oh_Standards_For_TchingProf_8_30_06.doc)

### *Standards*

1. Students: Teachers understand student learning and development, and respect the diversity of the students they teach.
  2. Content: Teachers know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.
  3. Assessment: Teachers understand and use varied assessments to inform instruction, evaluate and ensure student learning.
  4. Instruction: Teachers plan and deliver effective instruction that advances the learning of each individual student.
  5. Learning Environment: Teachers create learning environments that promote high levels of learning and achievement for all students.
  6. Collaboration and Communication: Teachers collaborate and communicate with students, parents, other educators, administrators, and the community to support student learning.
  7. Professional Responsibility and Growth: Teachers assume responsibility for professional growth, performance, and involvement as an individual and as a member of a learning community.
- 

### *Description and structure*

The document articulating the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession begins with a brief introduction that describes their purpose and structure. Each standard is organized into four sections as follows:

- *Standard*: Broad category of teacher knowledge and skills.
- *Narrative*: Summary of “key understandings, assumptions and beliefs” related to the Standard.
- *Elements*: Specific statements that define a teacher’s necessary knowledge and skills.
- *Indicators*: Observable and measurable evidence of the Element in practice.

All indicators are organized in matrix form according to three professional levels, defined as:

- *Proficient* teachers, who “demonstrate knowledge of the skills and abilities needed for effective content-area instruction. They are in the process of refining their skills and understandings to fully integrate their knowledge and skills. They monitor the situations in their classrooms and schools and respond appropriately” (p. 6).
- *Accomplished* teachers, who “effectively integrate the knowledge, skills and abilities needed for effective content-area instruction. They are fully skilled professionals who demonstrate purposefulness, flexibility and consistency. They anticipate and monitor situations in their classrooms and schools, and make appropriate plans and responses” (p. 6).



- *Distinguished* teachers, who “use their strong foundation of knowledge, skills and abilities to innovate and enhance their classrooms, buildings and districts. They are leaders who empower and influence others. They anticipate and monitor situations in their classrooms and schools and effectively reshape their environments accordingly. They respond to the needs of their colleagues and students immediately and effectively” (p. 6).

All Ohio teachers are expected to teach at the *Proficient* and the *Accomplished* levels during the course of their careers. The state’s teaching *Indicators* are cumulative, so teachers at the *Distinguished* level are those who have already demonstrated mastery of the skills and knowledge at the *Proficient* and *Accomplished* levels, though some teachers might be at one professional level with respect to one *Element* and at another level with respect to a different *Element*.

### *Development and dissemination*

The Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession were developed by the Ohio Educator Standards Board (OESB), which was established in 2004. According to a one-page separate preamble ([http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/Preamble1\\_Of\\_OH\\_Educator\\_Stnds\\_Docmnts.doc](http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/Preamble1_Of_OH_Educator_Stnds_Docmnts.doc)) to the standards, the standards development involved collaboration between teams of practicing educators and stakeholder groups who “studied other efforts, models, and research from national and international sources. Careful attention was paid to the empirical basis for the thinking in each set of standards. In addition, special reviews by experts in the field were obtained” (OESB 2005, p. 1).

Specifically, the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession cite two mid-1990’s publications as influential: the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory’s (1995) [\*Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis\*](#) and Charlotte Danielson’s 1996 publication, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*.

The State Board of Education officially adopted the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession in October 2005.

### *Standards’ target populations and current uses*

The Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession were designed to help guide teachers “as they continually reflect upon and improve their effectiveness as educators throughout all of the stages of their careers” (p. 1). The standards serve multiple audiences and have multiple purposes, including:

- Helping higher-education programs develop the content and requirements of pre-service training and development;
- Focusing the goals and objectives of districts and schools;
- Planning and guiding professional development; and
- Serving as a tool in developing coaching and mentoring programs.

### *Standards’ approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

**English learners.** The needs of EL students are addressed under *Standards 1* and *4* of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession:

Teachers model respect for students’ diverse cultures, language skills and experiences (*Standard 1, Element 1.4, p. 9*).

Teachers respect and value the native languages and dialects of their students, and use students’ current language skills to achieve content-area learning goals (*Standard 1, Element 1.4, Proficient Indicator d, p. 10*).

Teachers implement instructional strategies that support the learning of English as a second language and the use of Standard English in speaking and writing in the classroom (*Standard 1, Element 1.4, Accomplished Indicator f*, p. 9).

Teachers identify how individual experience, talents and prior learning as well as language, culture and family influence student learning and plan instruction accordingly (*Standard 4, Element 4.2, Proficient Indicator c*, p. 19).

**Special education.** The teaching of students with disabilities is also addressed in multiple sections of *Standard 1* as well as in *Standard 4*:

Teachers recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities and at-risk students in order to assist in appropriate identification, instruction and intervention (*Standard 1, Element 1.5*, p. 10).

Teachers assist in identifying gifted students, students with disabilities and at-risk students based on established practices (*Standard 1, Element 1.5, Proficient Indicator a*, p. 10).

Teachers follow laws and policies regarding gifted students, students with disabilities and at-risk students, and implement Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and Written Education Plans (WEPS) (*Standard 1, Element 1.5, Proficient Indicator b*, p. 10).

Teachers collaboratively develop and implement learning plans for gifted students, students with disabilities and at-risk students (*Standard 1, Element 1.5, Accomplished Indicator e*, p. 10).

Teachers advocate within the school, district and the broader community to ensure that gifted students, students with disabilities and at-risk students have access to all appropriate learning opportunities and resources (*Standard 1, Element 1.5, Distinguished Indicator g*, p. 10).

Teachers differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students (*Standard 4, Element 4.5*, p. 20).

### *Standards' approach to teachers' use of technology*

Multiple sections of *Standard 4* explicitly address teachers' use of technology:

Teachers use resources effectively, including technology, to enhance student learning (*Standard 4, Element 4.7*, p. 21).

Teachers effectively use technology that is appropriate to their disciplines (*Standard 4, Element 4.7, Proficient Indicator b*, p. 21).

Teachers effectively support students in their use of technology (*Standard 4, Element 4.7, Proficient Indicator c*, p. 21).

Teachers develop students' abilities to access, evaluate and use technology (*Standard 4, Element 4.7, Accomplished Indicator e*, p. 21).

Teachers help their colleagues understand and integrate technology into instruction (*Standard 4, Element 4.7, Distinguished Indicator f*, p. 21).

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

Multiple sections of *Standard 2* specifically address the state's academic content standards for students:

Teachers understand school and district curriculum priorities and the Ohio academic content standards (*Standard 2, Element 2.3*, p. 13).

Teachers articulate the important content, concepts and processes in school and district curriculum priorities and in the Ohio academic content standards (*Standard 2, Element 2.3, Proficient Indicator a*, p. 13).

Teachers extend and enrich curriculum by integrating school and district curriculum priorities with Ohio's academic content standards and national content standards (*Standard 2, Element 2.3, Accomplished Indicator b*, p. 13).

### *Additional reference*

Ohio Educator Standards Board. (2005). *Preamble to the Ohio Educator Standards Documents*. Retrieved October 2008, from [http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/Preamble1\\_Of\\_OH\\_Educator\\_Stnds\\_Docmnts.doc](http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/Preamble1_Of_OH_Educator_Stnds_Docmnts.doc).

## TEXAS

Title of standards: *Approved Educator Standards: Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility Standards (PPR [EC-12])*

Page length: 16

Available at <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/standtest/standards/allppr.pdf>

### *Standards*

1. The teacher designs instruction appropriate for all students that reflects an understanding of relevant content and is based on continuous and appropriate assessment.
  2. The teacher creates a classroom environment of respect and rapport that fosters a positive climate for learning, equity, and excellence.
  3. The teacher promotes student learning by providing responsive instruction that makes use of effective communication techniques, instructional strategies that actively engage students in the learning process, and timely, high-quality feedback.
  4. The teacher fulfills professional roles and responsibilities and adheres to legal and ethical requirements of the profession.
- 

### *Description and structure*

As a whole, the Texas Approved Educator Standards consist of 49 sets of standards, most differentiated by grade span and content area (<http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/standtest/edstancertfieldlevl.asp>). However, four subsets of the standards refer to Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR), and each of these subsets apply to teachers at one of the state's four certification levels (EC-4,<sup>9</sup> 4-8, 8-12, EC-12)<sup>10</sup> and are roughly equivalent to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The PPRs are organized into three sections: *Standard*, *Teacher Knowledge: What Teachers Know*, and *Application: What Teachers Can Do*.

### *Development and dissemination*

Texas' content-area-specific Approved Educator Standards are revised on an ongoing basis, each revision coinciding with scheduled revisions of the state's student academic standards. Representative committees of teachers, administrators, higher education representatives, content experts, parents, and business and community representatives review related student academic standards for each content area and develop (or revise) corresponding teacher standards. The Texas interviewee stated that all 49 sets of Texas Approved Educator Standards are aligned with the student academic standards (i.e., the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills). The PPRs are also revised on a regular basis, but revisions are triggered, not by the adoption of new content standards, but instead by the identification of new best practices and grade-appropriate learning theories.<sup>11</sup>

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) focuses dissemination efforts on teacher preparation programs, providing information and updates about revisions and examinations in the following ways:

<sup>9</sup> PPR standards for early childhood through 6th grade are currently being developed, and the PPR (EC-4) will be phased out when the new standards for the extended grade span are adopted.

<sup>10</sup> The Approved Educator Standards also include a set of PPR standards for teachers of Trade and Industrial Education. The standards and indicators for this set of teaching standards are completely different from the PPR standards that are grade-level specific and, as such, are not included in this review.

<sup>11</sup> The interviewee was not able to verify either the original dates of adoption of the PPRs or the dates of revisions, if any.

- At the annual meeting of preparation program directors,
- At twice-a-year training for the preparation programs,
- In a joint TEA/Educational Testing Service (Texas' contractor for teacher candidate assessment) newsletter,
- Through presentations at education preparation association meetings, and
- Through updates and announcements on a password-protected website for teacher preparation programs.

### *Standards' target populations and current uses*

As the name suggests, beginning teachers are the focus of the Texas Approved Educator Standards, including the PPR standards embedded within them. However, the Approved Educator Standards are used to guide the practice of experienced teachers to the extent that professional development is linked to those standards (see below). The Approved Educator Standards are used for multiple purposes.

- Preparation: Teacher preparation programs base their course offerings and requirements on the Approved Educator Standards.
- Certification: Teacher candidates must pass a test based on the PPRs, in addition to content examinations, to be certified.
- Induction: In Texas, induction is referred to as “mentoring,” and it occurs during student teaching or internships. Guidelines for field supervisors and mentors reflect the Approved Educator Standards.
- Professional development: Teachers must have continuing professional education every five years to renew their certificates. To become approved providers of professional development in Texas, outside professional development providers must demonstrate that the Approved Educator Standards are incorporated into their program as appropriate.

### *Standards' approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

For purposes of analyzing selected content, REL West reviewed the PPR (EC-12), which applies to all teachers, from early childhood education to 12th grade, and which is most akin to the CSTP in terms of content and purpose.

**English learners.** The Texas PPR (EC-12) standards address the EL population under *Standard I*:

The beginning teacher knows and understands:<sup>12</sup> appropriate strategies for instructing English language learners (*Teacher Knowledge 1.6k*, p. 2).

The beginning teacher is able to: adapt lessons to address students' varied backgrounds, skills, interests, and learning needs, including the needs of English language learners (*Application 1.2s*, p. 2).

In addition, the TEA is currently embedding English language standards into the PPR examination, as well as into the other grade- and subject-specific Approved Educator Standards, which are revised on a rolling basis.

---

<sup>12</sup> In the standards document itself, the phrases: “the beginning teacher knows and understands” and “the beginning teacher is able to” are not repeated after each indicator listed.

**Special education.** The PPR (EC-12) standards specifically address special education under *Standard IV* in the context of collaborating with other educators and legal requirements.

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the roles and responsibilities of specialists and other professionals at the building and district levels (e.g., department chairperson, principal, board of trustees, curriculum coordinator, special education professional) (*Standard IV, Teacher Knowledge 4.5k*, p. 14).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: legal requirements for educators (e.g., those related to special education, students and families' rights, student discipline, equity, child abuse) (*Standard IV, Teacher Knowledge 4.13k*, p. 16).

In addition, teacher knowledge and skills related to teaching students with disabilities are implied under *Standard II*:

The beginning teacher knows and understands: physical accessibility as a potential issue in student learning (*Teacher Knowledge 2.22k*, p. 9).

The beginning teacher is able to: create a safe and inclusive classroom environment (*Application 2.19s*, p. 9).

The Texas interviewee also indicated that special education is addressed to a limited extent in the PPR examination.

### *Standards' approach to teacher's use of technology*

Technology is addressed under three of the four Texas PPR (EC-12) standards:

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the importance of knowing when to integrate technology into instruction and assessment (*Standard I, Teacher Knowledge 1.17k*, p. 4).

The beginning teacher is able to: use technological tools to promote learning and expand instructional options (*Standard I, Application 1.17s*, p. 4).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: how materials, technology, and other resources may be used to support instructional goals and objectives and engage students in meaningful learning (*Standard I, Teacher Knowledge 1.22k*, p. 4).

The beginning teacher is able to: use a variety of assessment methods, including technology, that are appropriate for evaluating student achievement of instructional goals and objectives (*Standard I, Application 1.24s*, p. 5).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the role of technology in assessing student learning (*Standard I, Teacher Knowledge 1.28k*, p. 5).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: routines and procedures for managing and using materials, supplies, and technology (*Standard II, Teacher Knowledge 2.10k*, p. 7).

The beginning teacher is able to: implement routines and procedures for the effective management of materials, supplies, and technology (*Standard II, Application 2.10s*, p. 7).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the use of instructional materials, resources, and technologies that are appropriate and engaging for students in varied learning situations (*Standard III, Teacher Knowledge 3.7k*, p. 11).

The beginning teacher is able to: select and use instructional materials, resources, and technologies that are suitable for instructional goals and that engage students cognitively (*Standard III, Application 3.9s*, p. 11).

In addition, the Approved Educator Standards also include a set of standards for Technology Applications that are intended to apply to all beginning teachers across grade spans (<http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/standtest/standards/techapp.pdf>). Technology considerations are also being incorporated into the other grade- and subject-specific Approved Educator Standards as each is revised.

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

The Approved Educator Standards are based on and modeled after Texas' student academic standards, and they are revised alongside the student standards to ensure alignment. *Standard I* of the PPR (EC-12) standards addresses teachers' knowledge and skills of student academic standards as they relate to instructional planning, design, and assessment. Specifically:

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the importance of the state content and performance standards as outlined in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) (*Standard I, Teacher Knowledge 1.7k*, p. 3).

The beginning teacher is able to: use the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) to plan instruction (*Standard I, Application 1.6s*, p. 3).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the importance of designing instruction that reflects the TEKS (*Standard I, Teacher Knowledge 1.19k*, p. 4).

The beginning teacher is able to: plan instructional activities that progress sequentially and support stated instructional goals based on the TEKS (*Standard I, Application 1.19s*, p. 4).

The beginning teacher knows and understands: the connection between the Texas statewide assessment program, the TEKS, and instruction (*Standard I, Teacher Knowledge 1.30k*, p. 5).

**Appendix B**  
**Profiles of:**  
**National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Propositions and**  
**Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards**

**NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS**

Title of standards: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Propositions

Page length: 22

Available at [www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what\\_teachers.pdf](http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what_teachers.pdf)

*Five Core Propositions*

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning
  - Teachers recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly
  - Teachers have an understanding of how students develop and learn
  - Teachers treat students equitably
  - Teachers' mission extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their students
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students
  - Teachers appreciate how knowledge in their subjects is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines
  - Teachers command specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students
  - Teachers generate multiple paths to knowledge
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning
  - Teachers call on multiple methods to meet their goals
  - Teachers orchestrate learning in group settings
  - Teachers place a premium on student engagement
  - Teachers regularly assess student progress
  - Teachers are mindful of their principal objectives
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience
  - Teachers are continually making difficult choices that test their judgment
  - Teachers seek the advice of others and draw on education research and scholarship to improve their practice
5. Teachers are members of learning communities
  - Teachers contribute to school effectiveness by collaborating with other professionals
  - Teachers work collaboratively with parents
  - Teachers take advantage of community resources



---

### *Description and structure*

The *Five Core Propositions* are contained in an NBPTS policy statement entitled *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do*. This document opens with an introduction describing NBPTS's history and mission, followed by a brief overview of the *Five Core Propositions*.

According to NBPTS, "This enumeration [i.e., the five *Propositions*] suggests the broad base for expertise in teaching but conceals the complexities, uncertainties and dilemmas of the work. The formal knowledge teachers rely on accumulates steadily, yet provides insufficient guidance in many situations. Teaching ultimately requires judgment, improvisation, and conversation about means and ends. Human qualities, expert knowledge and skill, and professional commitment together compose excellence in this craft" (p. 2). The NBPTS *Propositions* tend to be general statements about professional teaching, and they do not identify specific teacher actions or behaviors.

Following the introductory overview, the remaining 15 pages of the NBPTS further elaborate on each core *Proposition*, identifying three to five boldfaced elements within each one (see list above), which are themselves further explained in a series of supporting statements.

### *Development and dissemination*

NBPTS set out to clearly describe its vision of accomplished teacher practice almost immediately after the organization's founding in 1987. In 1989 it issued its first policy statement, *What Teachers Should Know And Be Able To Do*. The document, which was updated most recently in 2002, has essentially served as the foundation for all standards development work the NBPTS has conducted over the past 20 years.

### *Standards' target populations and current uses*

According to NBPTS, *What Teachers Should Know And Be Able To Do* "remains the cornerstone of the system of National Board Certification and has served as a guide to school districts, states, colleges, universities and others with a strong interest in strengthening the initial and ongoing education of America's teachers" (p. 1). NBPTS also sees the document as a tool for teacher self-reflection, as a catalyst for healthy debate and the forging of a new professional consensus on accomplished practice, and as an expression of ideals that guides all of the organization's standards and assessment processes.

### *Standards' approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

**English learners.** English learners and second language acquisition and development are addressed under the first element of NBPTS *Proposition 5*:

The various forms of English as a second language, bilingual and English-immersion programs often require cooperation among teachers of non- and limited-English-speaking youth. National Board Certified teachers are adept at identifying students who might benefit from such special attention and at working in tandem with specialists (*Proposition 5*, [element 1], *Teachers contribute to school effectiveness by collaborating with other professionals*, pp. 18–19).

**Special education.** The teaching of students with disabilities or other special needs is addressed in several areas of the NBPTS *Propositions*:

As stewards for the interests of students, accomplished teachers are vigilant in ensuring that all pupils receive their fair share of attention, and that biases based on real or perceived ability differences, handicaps or disabilities, social or cultural background, language, race, religion, or gender do not distort relationships between themselves and their students... accomplished teachers employ what is known about ineffectual and effective practice with diverse groups of students,

while striving to learn more about how best to accommodate those differences (*Proposition 1*, [element 3], *Teachers treat students equitably*, p. 9).

Many special education teachers have a slightly different orientation — focusing on skill development as they work to help moderately and profoundly handicapped students achieve maximum independence in managing their lives. Understanding the ways of knowing within a subject is crucial to the National Board Certified teacher's ability to teach students to think analytically (*Proposition 2*, [element 1], *Teachers appreciate how knowledge in their subjects is created, organized and linked to other disciplines*, p. 10).

The increased practice of “mainstreaming” special-needs students to assure that they are being educated in the least restrictive environment has meant that general and special education teachers need to work with one another (*Proposition 5*, [element 1], *Teachers contribute to school effectiveness by collaborating with other professionals*, pp. 18–19).

### *Standards' approach to teacher's use of technology*

The use of technology is addressed under *Proposition 2*:

Professional teachers' commitment to learning about new materials includes keeping abreast of technological developments that have implications for teaching; for example, how to engage students in the rapidly expanding field of computer technology, as well as how to use the computer to enhance their own teaching (*Proposition 2*, [element 2], *Teachers command specialized knowledge of how to convey a subject to students*, p. 11).

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

Connections to standards and accountability are made only implicitly in one of the supporting statements for NBPTS *Proposition 5*. This statement refers to the importance of teachers contributing to school effectiveness by being knowledgeable about learning goals and objectives established by state and local authorities (see p. 18).

## INTERSTATE NEW TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND SUPPORT CONSORTIUM (INTASC)

Title of standards: *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue*

Page length: 36

Available at <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>

### *Principles*

The teacher...

1. Understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
2. Understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.
3. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.
4. Understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
5. Uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
6. Uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
7. Plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
8. Understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.
9. Is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
10. Fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

### *Description and structure*

According to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), its standards “embody the kinds of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that teachers need to practice responsibly when they enter teaching and that prepare them for eventual success as (National) Board-certified teachers later in their careers” (p. 5). Each of the INTASC standards is organized into four sections:

- *Core Principle*
- *Knowledge*
- *Dispositions*
- *Performances*

### *Development and dissemination*

INTASC released its model standards for licensing new teachers in 1992. A large task force of representatives from professional teaching organizations collaborated with personnel from 17 state education agencies over 18 months to develop the standards and define shared views about what constitutes competent beginning teaching. The INTASC task force relied upon the NBPTS propositions (detailed in previous profile) as a reference point, and also drew upon previous work in states like California, Minnesota, New York, and Texas.

The standards were disseminated to SEAs, policymakers, and professional development institutions “as a resource to revisit state standards for training and licensing new teachers, and to consider ways these models might enhance their system” (p. 3). They have subsequently informed standards development in several states in the years since their publication.

### *Standards’ target populations and current uses*

These standards are intended for beginning teachers. As evident in their title, they are also intended to serve as a model for states to use in developing their own teaching standards, as was the case for Florida and Illinois (as described in their profiles).

### *Standards’ approach to addressing the needs of special populations*

**English learners.** English learners and language development are addressed in the Knowledge sections under *Principle 3*.

The teacher knows about the process of second language acquisition and about strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English (*Principle 3, Knowledge [3]*, p. 18).

**Special education.** The teaching of students with special needs or disabilities is addressed in the Knowledge and Performances sections under *Principle 3*.

The teacher knows about areas of exceptionality in learning — including learning disabilities, visual and perceptual difficulties, and special physical or mental challenges (*Principle 3, Knowledge [2]*, p. 18).

### *Standards’ approach to teacher’s use of technology*

The use of technology is addressed under *Principles 4* and *6*.

The teacher knows how to enhance learning through the use of a wide variety of materials as well as human and technological resources (e.g., computers, audio-visual technologies, videotapes and discs, local experts, primary documents and artifacts, texts, reference books, literature, and other print resources) (*Principle 4, Knowledge [3]*, p. 20).

The teacher knows how to use a variety of media communication tools, including audio-visual aids and computers, to enrich learning opportunities (*Principle 6, Performances [5]*, p. 26).

### *Connection to standards and accountability*

The INTASC standards were developed in a cross-state effort and were not intended to align with the accountability system or academic content standards of any particular state.

## References

*Note: The state standards documents that were reviewed for this report are listed in bold-face type.*

Center for International Understanding website, University of North Carolina. Available at <http://ciu.northcarolina.edu/content.php/system/index.htm>

Cotton, K. (1995). *Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis 1995 update*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Available at <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/esp/esp95.html>

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

**Florida Department of Education. (n.d.). *Educator Accomplished Practices: Competencies for teachers of the 21st century*. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/approval.asp>**

Florida Department of Education. (2002). *Overview: Introduction to the Educator Accomplished Practices*. Retrieved September 2008, from [http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student\\_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf](http://coe.fau.edu/OASS/student_teaching/EAP-Overview.pdf)

**Illinois State Board of Education. (2002). *Illinois Professional Teaching Standards [24.100]* (2nd ed.). Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/pdfs/ipts.pdf>**

Illinois State Board of Education. (2002). *Language Arts Standards for all Illinois teachers [24.110]* (2nd ed.). Retrieved August 2008, from [http://www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/CASCDvr/pdfs/24110\\_corelangarts\\_std.pdf](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/CASCDvr/pdfs/24110_corelangarts_std.pdf)

Illinois State Board of Education. (2002). *Technology Standards for all Illinois teachers [24.120]* (2nd ed.). Retrieved August 2008, from [http://www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/CASCDVr/pdfs/24120\\_coretechnology.pdf](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/profprep/CASCDVr/pdfs/24120_coretechnology.pdf)

**Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). (1992). *Model standards for beginning teacher licensing, assessment and development: A resource for state dialogue*. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>**

**National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). (1989, revised 2002). *What teachers should know and be able to do*. Retrieved August 2008, from [http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what\\_teachers.pdf](http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what_teachers.pdf)**

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs (NCELA). Illinois' EL/LEP total and % derived from SY2004–05 data, available at <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/faq/01leps.html>.

National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (2002). *Illinois Certification Testing System: Fields 101-104, Assessment of professional teaching test framework*. Retrieved September 2008, from [http://www.icts.nesinc.com/PDFs/IL\\_OBJ101\\_104.pdf](http://www.icts.nesinc.com/PDFs/IL_OBJ101_104.pdf)

- North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission. (2007, June).** *North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards*. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.ncptsc.org/Final%20Standards%20Document.pdf>
- North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission. (2008, August). *North Carolina teacher evaluation process*. Denver, CO: McREL. Retrieved September 2008, from <http://www.ncptsc.org/Teacher-enabled.pdf>
- North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey website. Available at [www.ncteachingconditions.org](http://www.ncteachingconditions.org)
- Ohio Educator Standards Board. (2006).** *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Retrieved August 2008, from [http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/Word/Oh\\_Standards\\_For\\_TchingProf\\_8\\_30\\_06.doc](http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/Word/Oh_Standards_For_TchingProf_8_30_06.doc)
- Ohio Educator Standards Board. (2005). *Preamble to the Ohio Educator Standards documents*. Retrieved October 2008, from [http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/Preamble1\\_Of\\_OH\\_Educator\\_Stnds\\_Docmnts.doc](http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/Preamble1_Of_OH_Educator_Stnds_Docmnts.doc)
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills website. Available at <http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/>
- Texas State Board for Educator Certification. (Updated April 2008). *Approved New Educator Standards*. Available at <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/standtest/edstancertfieldlev1.asp>
- Texas State Board for Educator Certification. (n.d.).** *Approved New Educator Standards: Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility Standards (EC-Grade 12)*. Retrieved September 2008, from <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/standtest/standards/allppr.pdf>
- Texas State Board for Educator Certification. (2003). *Approved New Educator Standards: Technology Applications*. Retrieved September 2008, from <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/standtest/standards/techapp.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Common Core of Data (CCD)*, Local Education Agency Universe Survey, 2005–06 v.1a; State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education, 2005–06 v.1a. Data available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.